

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Robert Gensemer](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: WOE framework attempt
Date: 07/07/2006 10:03 AM

I am open all day on Monday, so a working session works for me. If you send it to the LWG, I would note that the key (esp the weighting) may change based on what we find with our runs, and emphasize that we are doing this to ensure meaningful results and the usability of the matrix, and not to "bias" the results (I thought I caught a hint of concern of that in one of John's e-mails). I am still available today at 1:30 (b) (6) if you want to discuss a path forward.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Gensemer [mailto:rgensemer@parametrix.com]
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 7:44 AM
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Cc: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: WOE framework attempt

Thanks, Jennifer. I fully anticipated we would not at first agree on weighting assignments, and this would require talking through reasons for selection, etc. That is why I added some comments on the spreadsheet to explain at least a few of my choices. That is also why I did not go further on other receptors or LOEs until we had a chance to discuss the first stab at this together. I thought it would have been pointless to move on to other receptors until we had talked the first one through.

I agree with you that to fully exercise this thing, we need to add weighting scores for other receptors. What is your day like on Monday...should I come up to work through this with you in person? My day is open at this point, as is Tuesday if needs be. I can bring a projector, so we can work on the same file version together more easily.

Lets discuss this afternoon to be sure, but my recommendation is to submit the key to LWG today, but without any weighting scores filled in for any of the receptors. I will prepare a version of the spreadsheet with the key and existing four receptor spreadsheet pages, but each of the receptor pages would be blank except for the calculating formulas. Then, next week you and I work through weighting for several receptors while LWG has a look at the key, then we set up a meeting with them (phone or direct) to talk things through and agree on a path forward.
-Bob

Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.
Parametrix, Inc.
33972 Texas Street SW
Albany, OR 97321
T 541-791-1667, x-6510
F 541-791-1699
C 541-760-1511
rgensemer@parametrix.com

>>> "PETERSON Jenn L" <PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us> 7/6/2006 9:50:28 PM >>>
Hi Bob,

I took a look at the matrix, and unfortunately not enough was done for us to really understand the implications of the weighting. I think we needed to do a few additional receptors, and understand how the weighting criteria changed among them. We needed to see if they were relevant and applicable for all. Also, we needed to see if we were clear enough that if different users used the matrix they would come to similar conclusions (otherwise we would need to clarify or modify the

criteria). At this point, I don't have time to do that exercise myself before tomorrow. Since there is such a deadline to get this out, I guess we should throw it to LWG to work on it together. However, I may spend some time on Monday trying to work through the matrix so we can be aware of the problem areas as we move forward.

We could talk tomorrow about some of the weights you assigned to the benthic community - I don't understand all of your thinking, so maybe discussions on that could point to some potential changes in the key. Let me know - I am available at 1:30.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Gensemer [mailto:rgensemer@parametrix.com]

Sent: Friday, June 30, 2006 3:22 PM

To: PETERSON Jenn L

Subject: WOE framework attempt

Hi Jennifer. I'm going to pass this along to you early since I'd rather get input from you first before going any farther. I tried out most, but not all, of the benthic community LOEs, and found the process to be pretty interesting. In general, I found the scoring relatively easy to do, but I was obviously more familiar and comfortable scoring the effects data than I did the exposure data--you are likely much more familiar there. I also added a few comments explaining to you why I made certain choices along the way.

Generally, I think the scheme is working pretty well for a first stab, except the the total dynamic range in the final integrated score is not very large. The final scores accurately--in my view--identify the highest vs. the lowest weighted LOES, but the range is only from about 2.9 - 4.5. In contrast, the effects vs. exposure scores were much more clear as to which LOEs were higher-weighted, so perhaps there is a flaw in the final integrated score calculation. Maybe its not appropriate to weight relevance, effects, and exposure scores equally? Relevance scores were all fairly high, so perhaps that swamps out some of the differences in effects or exposure.

Anyway, have a look and lets talk next Thursday or Friday as planned. Hope you have (had?) a good holiday weekend.

-Bob

Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.

Parametrix, Inc.

33972 Texas Street SW

Albany, OR 97321

T 541-791-1667, x-6510

F 541-791-1699

C 541-760-1511

rgensemer@parametrix.com
